



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,391	04/22/2004	Charles E. Brooks	7037.001	5409

7590 11/25/2005

William A. Blake
Jones, Tullar & Cooper, P.C.
Eads Station
P.O. Box 2266
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER

MORILLO, JANELLE COMBS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1742

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/829,391	Applicant(s) BROOKS ET AL.	
	Examiner Janelle Combs-Morillo	Art Unit 1742	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,23-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 23-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9, 23-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warner (US 2002/0162609A1).

Warner teaches an alloy with 9-11% Zn, 1.8-3.0% Mg, 1.2-2.6% Cu, at least one of Mn, Cr, 0.05-0.20% Zr, Hf, V, Ti and 0.05-0.3% Sc (abstract), which overlaps or touches the boundary of the presently claimed alloying ranges (cl. 1-7, 23-29, 32-41, 44-50).

Overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness, see MPEP § 2144.05. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of the range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in the prior art, because the prior art finds that said composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. Because Warner teaches a substantial overlap in alloying ranges, it is held that Warner has created a prima facie case of obviousness of the presently claimed invention.

Concerning dependent claims 8, 30, 42, 44, Warner teaches said alloy typically contains about 0.05% Si and 0.07% Fe (see Table 4), which falls within the instant ranges.

Concerning dependent claims 9, 31, 43, 51, Warner teaches said 7xxx series alloy has excellent mechanical properties and is suitable for high strength rolled, extruded, or forged products {0002}, [0005], such as aerospace wings [0002].

Response to Amendment/Arguments

3. In the response filed on September 12, 2005, applicant amended claims 1, 23, and added new claims 32-51. The examiner agrees that no new matter has been added.

Applicant's argument that the present invention is allowable over the prior art of record because the prior art does not specify using Sc and Zr together, or the instant Si and Fe amounts, or the instant Mg+Cu range has not been found persuasive. Warner teaches overlapping ranges of Sc, Zr, Mg, Cu, and amounts of Si and Fe that fall within the instant ranges. When an invention is defined by providing ranges for the amount of the various components, a *prima facie* case of obviousness arises when the ranges of a claimed composition overlap the ranges disclosed in the prior art. See *In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *In re Geisler*, 116 F.3d 1465, 1469, 1469 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *In re Malagari*, 499 F.2d 1297, 1303 (CCPA 1974). Where the "claimed ranges are completely encompassed by the prior art, the conclusion [that the claims are *prima facie* obvious] is even more compelling than in cases of mere overlap." *Peterson*, 315 F.3d at 1330. Even without complete overlap of the claimed range and the prior art range, a minor difference shows a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *Haynes Int'l v. Jessup Steel Co.*, 8 F.3d 1573, 1577 n.3 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In the instant case, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established because the ranges taught by Warner significantly overlap the presently claimed alloying ranges.

When the Examiner has established a *prima facie* obviousness, the burden then shifts to the applicant to rebut. *In re Dillon*, 919 F.2d 688, 692, 16 USPQ2d 1897, 1901 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc). Rebuttal may take the form of "a comparison of test data showing that the claimed compositions possess unexpectedly improved properties... that the prior art does not have, that

Art Unit: 1742

the prior art is so deficient that there is no motivation to make what might otherwise appear to be obvious changes, or any other argument.. that is pertinent.” Id. at 692-93; USPQ2d 1901.

Applicant has not clearly shown specific unexpected results with respect to the prior art of record or criticality of the instant claimed range (wherein said results must be fully commensurate in scope with the instantly claimed ranges, etc. see MPEP 716.02 d).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. However, these references are held to be no more analogous to the presently stated claims than the references used to reject the claims.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1742

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Combs-Morillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1240. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am- 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JCM
November 17, 2005


GEORGE WYSZOMIERSKI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1742